1. Call to Order (Bevilacqua) 11:05

2. Announcements (Bevilacqua)
   a. Approval of minutes 2/2/2021
   b. Proposals submitted for CoC completeness review:
      Curriculum Proposal Environmental Health (minor revision)
      Public Health minor (new)
      Visual Resources Certificate (new)
      Course Proposal FCH 502, Research Ethics (new)
      19 additional proposals have been submitted as of yesterday’s deadline.
   c. Proposals posted for comment:
      Course Proposal SRE 496, Special Topics in Sustainable Energy Management (new)
      Course Proposal FCH 380, Analytical Chemistry I (major revision)
      Course Proposal FCH 382, Analytical Chemistry Lab I (new)
   d. Administrative Approvals:
      None
   e. Updates from Dean Shannon

3. Action Items
   a. EST 204 Diversity and Knowledge of the Environment (new)
      • Gen Ed question- can it count for 3 different categories? Should Humanities be unchecked? We determined that it should be removed from humanities.
      • Section 2.1/2.3 meet requirements for breadth and depth. What is the meaning of that wording? What are the department requirements? Sharon referred to the SLOs of EST department, which are the reference point for the course proposal language.
      • Can the enrollment be increased beyond 20 or be offered more frequently? If approved, potentially it could be expanded. This was limited initially because of the desire to do field trips and needing to transport folks. There are other classes that are much larger that do field trips. Would 30-40 be better? We could see this be in a much higher demand course. Sharon will adjust the current cap to 35, and if the demand is higher, the course will have to be revised to accommodate that. With the
type of conversations happening, we want to be able to provide the right scaffolding to do the work well. If we expand too far, it could create issues with outcomes.

- Editorial: 3.3 SLOs 3rd one- understand is a hard quantifier. 4th one, remove the words, leave “be able to” because they are redundant to the preface statement.
- 3.5 methods include field trips. If there are, section 5 needs to be filled out or notes justifying why there are no health/safety concerns. Sharon suggests using the wording “may include field trips” to cover that. **Approved 7-0-1**

b. Certificate in Environmental Justice and Inequality (new)

- Section 2.3 on Form 2C. Question on the math for FTE. The calculations are off for that (8 part-time don’t equal 3 FTE)
- Include the new title for EST 615 that is being changed at this meeting. **Approved 7-0-1**

c. MPS in Environmental Leadership, Justice & Communication (new)

- List of classes, title on EST 615 (page 7) and table on page 11 need to reflect the new title.
- Page 8- GRE questions on whether or not it is needed. It is not required for this program, but the Graduate School website indicates all programs require it. In practice programs like the MLA waive this for most students. Other programs have, particularly this year. GRE has been shown to be biased and lacks substantial evidence of predicting success. For an online program that is not research based, there is no real need for it and would be an unnecessary barrier to the population that is being targeted. It will be built into the application so they will skip over this portion.
- Question on the lack of seminars. Is this required of the MPS programs? Scott says that most of the MPS degrees do not have that, just MS and PhD. **Approved 7-0-1**

d. EST 615- Environmental Justice: Policy, Tools & Society (minor revision)

- Is this another section of 615 or is the in-person 615 not going to be taught anymore? The in-person isn’t necessarily going away, but for the near-term it will be offered online asynchronously.
- There was a question about the MPS program language, which states the courses that have been in-person, will continue to be in-person, but that contradicts what is in this proposal. The decision will be based on enrollment. If it becomes necessary, there can be a switch to doing both, but the plan for now is to keep it online only.
- Course should be listed as required for both programs that it was approved for (certificate and MPS).
- 3.2.2.d. asks if there is an identical course. EST 615 is listed, which is confusing because it is the course being proposed. Brings up the question, is this a new course or a revision? Maybe more specificity on how this will be taught will clear this up. It is not a new class, so the language can be changed to correct that.
- Section 3, tech resources, but just the CNS office is listed. What is the specific resources that you need for that? Change language to reflect the actual need. Online courses need a suite of support. Basically the institution needs to provide the access to learning management tool. Is ArcGIS is available remotely? It is, but the class actually doesn’t use it. The question was also raised do students need a GIS course as a prerequisite? They do the learning in the class, rather than needing to have that as a background. **Approved 8-0-0**
e. EST 616- Global Perspectives on Environmental Justice (new)- Add that this is required in the new cert and MPS. **Approved 8-0-0**

4. Old Business
5. New Business

**Course revisions- modality/instructional methods**

- If a course is only changing modality, does it need to go to this group? Or can it be approved administratively? We believe the Provost’s concern was more directed at undergraduate course changes.
- If a course is a lecture, it may not matter as much. If it’s lab or field, it would probably need closer review by CoC.
- Lecture/seminar courses may be offered in multiple ways (online, in-person, hybrid). Some may choose to do both to offer opportunities to students. Does the switch change the learning outcomes? That’s what will really matter.
- If you’re changing the format, you should be changing the instructional methods as well as the institutional resources that are being used. Depending on the demands that creates for things like remote desktops, we may need to be looking at resource allocation more closely.
- There are some limitations to field and lab courses, but many institutions offer online programming in lab based courses. We need to be careful not to think of online as “second-rate” or lower quality.
- Suggestion: Should we create a policy that determines which courses need a full review based on their delivery? If it’s online asynchronous, it may need to change the methods more than a synchronous online course.
- If we want to really discuss online programs, we should invite Brandon and Ashley into the conversations as our online course experts.